

**STRATEGY
RESEARCH
PROJECT**

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

**RESERVE COMPONENT OFFICER PROFESSIONAL
DEVELOPMENT**

BY

**LIEUTENANT COLONEL MICHAEL W. BEAMAN
United States Army National Guard**

19990527 005

**DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for public release.
Distribution is unlimited.**

USAWC CLASS OF 1999



U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

Reserve Component Officer Professional Development

by

LTC Michael W. Beaman
Infantry

Dr. Roderick R. Magee
Project Advisor

The views expressed in this academic research paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the U.S. Government, the Department of Defense, or any of its agencies.

U.S. Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for public release.
Distribution is unlimited.

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Michael W. Beaman
TITLE: Reserve Component Officer Professional Development
FORMAT: Strategy Research Project
DATE: 22 April 1999 PAGES: 35 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

The current professional development program in the Army is not preparing enough reserve component officers to be able to perform as strategic leaders in the year 2010 and beyond. This paper will review two sources of learning: formal military education and experience learned on the job. This paper will focus on experiences of officers at the rank of Major, Lieutenant Colonel and Colonel. The formal education evaluated is the United States Command and General Staff Officer Course and the United States Army War College.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS	vii
RESERVE COMPONENT PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION	1
BACKGROUND ON COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF OFFICER COURSE	2
BACKGROUND ON UNITED STATES ARMY WAR COLLEGE	8
EDUCATION THROUGH EXPERIENCE	14
LESSONS FROM CIVILIAN LEADERSHIP	20
SUMMARY	23
RECOMMENDATION	24
CONCLUSION	29
ENDNOTES	31
BIBLIOGRAPHY	33

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure 1: Comparison of active duty and reserve component experience.	16
Figure 2: Sample biographic profile of a strategic leader in the reserve component in the year 2010.	27

RESERVE COMPONENT PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

Our National Military Strategy is based upon three principle tasks: (1) ability to RESPOND to the current crisis; (2) ability to SHAPE the environment; and (3) ability to PREPARE for the future.¹ The focus of this paper is on the reserve component officer (Army Reserve and National Guard) and how the Army currently prepares him for future assignments as a strategic leader. As the Reserve Components are integrated into the active forces it is imperative that all leaders be trained to one standard with the ability to operate in a seamless force. Currently, the reserve component officer is at a distinct disadvantage because he does not experience the same training opportunities provided to his active component counterpart.

This paper will evaluate two sources of learning, for Reserve Component officers, which occurs between the ranks of Major through Colonel. Command and General Staff Officer Course (CGSOC), at Ft Leavenworth, Kansas and the United States Army War College (USAWC) at Carlisle, Pennsylvania are the first source of learning, and the second source of learning is experience which is learned on-the-job throughout an officer's career. Each source of learning for the Reserve Component officer will be evaluated and compared to the same source of learning available to the Active Component soldier.

BACKGROUND ON COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF OFFICER COURSE

The Command and General Staff Officer Course (CGSOC), is available to all majors in the Army. Attendance is required for promotion to the rank of Lieutenant Colonel (O-5). The mission of CGSOC is to educate officers in the values and attitudes of the profession of arms and in the conduct of military operations during peace, conflict, and war, with primary emphasis at the division and corps levels.² The goals of CGSOC are to develop officers who:

- Display tactical and technical combined arms proficiency
- Understand joint force employment at the operational and tactical levels of war
- Can prepare, fight and sustain forces across the spectrum of conflict
- Can apply the perspectives of military history
- Embody the principles, attitudes, and values of military leadership
- Can solve complex problems systematically and under pressure
- Understand the role of the military in a free society
- Communicate effectively in a variety of media
- Confidently accept higher levels of responsibility³

Students can attend CGSOC through the resident, non-resident classroom option course or the correspondence course. The objectives, as well as the tasks, conditions and standards, for all three courses, are designed to be the same.⁴ Active duty officers, Army Reserve officers, National Guard officers, International officers and Department of Defense civilians make up the composition of the class. The majority of Reserve Component officers enrolled attend only term I of the resident course. All of the core course requirements are completed during this term. Lack of sufficient funding requires most Reserve Component officers to terminate after term I and return to home station. Satisfactory completion of Term I of CGSOC meets all requirements for eligibility for promotion to the rank of Lieutenant Colonel.

Advanced Application Program courses (electives) are available for all students who remain at Ft. Leavenworth and attend term II of CGSOC. For the next five months Active Component officers may choose from over one hundred fifty courses ranging from Corp Operations to Logistics Automation to Homeland Defense to Information Warfare. Many officers build proficiency in their specialty area while others broaden their base of knowledge in other areas of expertise. This opportunity for increased proficiency provides the active duty officer with valuable tools needed for future assignments. Many Reserve

Component officers are not afforded this same opportunity; thus, active duty officers appear to gain a distinct advantage in proficiency.

Webster's dictionary defines proficiency as "the advancement toward the attainment of a high degree of knowledge or skill" and proficient as "well advanced in an art, occupation skill or branch of knowledge." CGSOC is where the formal military education system begins to fail to meet the needs of the RC officer and produces a senior Reserve Component officer that will not be ready to meet the challenges required when selected as a senior leader in the Army.

RC officers enrolled in the correspondence course option complete course work over a three-year period which covers the same subjects as term I of the resident course. The correspondence course is divided into four phases: I, II, III, and IV. Any student can complete CGSOC through correspondence by any one of the three following options:

Option One: All four phases may be taken by correspondence. All reference and reading material is sent to the soldier's home along with the written assignments and test requirements. At the completion of each lesson, the soldier returns the test and proceeds to the next lesson in that phase.

Option Two: Phase I and III are completed through correspondence and Phase II and IV are completed in an active

duty for training (ADT) status. The period of ADT is two weeks long and the course is available at numerous sites across the country. Phase II and phase IV are normally conducted after the completion of Phase I and/or Phase III.

Option Three: Phase I and III are completed in a non-resident classroom environment conducted one day a week at a United States Army Reserve school. RC officers usually attend these classes in a non-pay status. Phase II and IV may be completed in ADT status as explained in option one.

The CGSOC opportunity is the first major discriminator in the army for both active duty and Reserve Component officers. Only 50% of eligible majors on active duty are selected for attendance at the resident course.⁵ All other active duty majors must take one of the correspondence course options in order to be eligible for promotion to Lieutenant Colonel. Reserve Component officers must compete for a limited number of resident seats provided by TRADOC. The available number of seats for RC officers at the resident course has fluctuated over the past several years from as many as 105 seats per class to as low as 55 seats per class.⁶ This allows approximately 5% of all eligible RC officers in the rank of Major the opportunity to attend the resident course.

While there is no established policy that identifies the resident course as superior to the non-resident course, the

overwhelming perception is that resident graduates seem to reap greater career benefits over the corresponding studies graduates. For example, discussion with a number of active duty Lieutenant Colonels indicates that resident course graduates are regarded more highly for the choice S-3 and XO assignments when they return to the field.⁷ As we review the current CGSOC program and make appropriate recommendations for revisions, perhaps the following questions deserve some attention.

1. What is the discriminator for determining which AC officers attend the resident course?
2. Why are resident course graduates selected more often than non-resident graduates for the choice S-3 and XO assignments when they return to the field?
3. If the task, condition and standards are the same for all the different CGSOC options and the cost of the correspondence course is significantly less, then why send anyone to the resident course?
4. If the Advanced Application Program courses for term II of the resident course are critical for active duty soldiers, why are they not just as critical for the RC officer?
5. Over 50% of the Army personnel structure reside in the Reserve Component. If it's truly "One Army" and the desire is for total integration and a seamless force, why wouldn't 50% of the seats at the CGSOC resident course be reserved for RC officers?

Officers who attend the Command and General Staff Officer Course in the resident status enjoy advantages over corresponding studies students. For example, resident students are exposed to excellent instruction and subject matter experts throughout the course. They develop close relationships with AC, RC, international (foreign students). Such opportunities are not available to corresponding studies students. Resident students can focus totally on their learning experience as that is their assigned duty. Non-Resident students suffer the distraction of their day-to-day job requirements, as the Distance Learning option is an additional duty.

There are, however, some disadvantages with the resident option. Only 50% of active duty officers and a small percentage of eligible reserve component officers can attend the resident option thus creating a "have and have not" mentality. The other disadvantage of the resident course is the expense. The resident student creates a tremendous cost for the Army compared to the Distance Learning student. Those officers selected for the resident option must execute a permanent change of duty station (PCS). The extreme example would be an AC officer coming from overseas and then back overseas at the completion of the course.

There are advantages and disadvantages associated with the Non-Resident option as well. The cost savings alone is worth review. Officers taking this option may continue in their

current assignments and still become qualified for promotion. Active duty officers would pick up an additional year of experience over their resident student peers while the Reserve Component officer would pick up five months. A significant advantage to this option is that the traditional RC officer, who can not afford to leave his civilian job for more than two weeks, will not be penalized and put at a marked disadvantage to the full-time soldier. This option, however, has some significant disadvantages. Because of civilian job requirements, most students complete the correspondence course as painlessly as possible. In other words, they simply look up the needed answers for each lesson rather than study the course in depth. Additionally, they do not develop valuable relationships needed between the active, Reserve Component officer as well as other service component officers.

BACKGROUND ON UNITED STATES ARMY WAR COLLEGE

Officer's that complete CGSOC and are promoted to the rank of Lieutenant Colonel compete later for the opportunity to attend the United States Army War College (USAWC). The major difference between CGSOC and USAWC is that officers must be selected to attend USAWC in a resident or Distance Learning status while all Majors may complete CGSOC.

The mission of the United States Army War College is to "prepare selected military, civilian, and international leaders to assume strategic responsibilities in military and national security organizations. Students learn about the employment of landpower as part of a unified, joint, or multi-national force in support of America's national military strategy. They also learn how to research operational and strategic issues; and how to conduct outreach programs of benefit to the USAWC, the U.S. Army, and the nation."⁸ The goals of the USAWC are structured to prepare officers who can:

- Distinguish the uniqueness of strategic level leadership
- Manage change by applying resources to the process for translating strategy into force requirements and capabilities
- Advise, in concert with other elements of national power, on the role the military has in national security strategy formulations
- Analyze threats and other factors which affect U.S. interests
- Apply strategic thought to U.S. national security decision making processes
- Develop theater strategies, estimates and campaign plans to employ unified, joint, and multi-national forces
- Synthesize critical elements of warfare at the strategic and operational level⁹

AC or RC officers, if selected, may attend (USAWC) through one of two options: a one-year resident course, or the two-year Distance Education Course (DEC). The resident course is composed of active duty Army, Navy, Air Force, Coast Guard, Marine, Army Reserve, National Guard officers, International officers and selected senior Department of Defense civilians. The DEC offers a largely non-resident option to active duty Army officers, members of the Reserve Components, the U.S. Marine Corps and selected senior Department of the Army civilians.¹⁰ All DEC students attend a two-week midcourse resident phase as well as a two-week end-of-course resident phase at the U.S. Army War College. The DEC and resident courses are based on similar core curricula. It is the goal of the Department of Distance Education to parallel the resident course in every way possible.¹¹

The two options for completing the United States Army War College (USAWC) appear to provide similar benefits for students. Both programs are unique and offer many advantages, as well as a few disadvantages. The USAWC Resident Course allows students to work in a seminar group setting, which in turn develops team-building skills. Interaction between services (Army, Air Force, Navy, U.S. Marine Corp) as well as Army Reserve, National Guard, Department of the Army civilians, and international officers allow these students to develop relationships not available to

Distance Education students. These relationships prove beneficial, almost invaluable, later in their careers. All students benefit from the daily discussion with their active duty counterparts. Many of the students provide personal insights to the subject matter presented each day. Many have been "on the ground" or have direct knowledge of soldiers that were involved in a variety of recent operations.

In a school environment you have a number of valuable resources (library, speakers, audio visual aids, faculty advisors, contacts provided by other students) not available to the Distance Education student. Weekly briefings allow students to observe others as well as participate in graded speaking assignments. Immediate feedback, from peers, provides the student the opportunity to evaluate strengths and weaknesses and quickly make the appropriate adjustments within the limited time before the next opportunity.

The following may be perceived as disadvantages to attending the resident course. Group projects allow some individuals to "slide" while others do the majority of the work. Fewer written products with the resident option may give the non-resident peer a significant advantage in developing writing skills. Currently only 10% of the active duty Lieutenant Colonels in the Army are selected to attend this course. This, again, draws attention to the basis for those selected versus

the non-selected officer that may be working in the same office, doing virtually the same job and both at the rank of Colonel.

The USAWC Distance Education Course provides the student with two years of intense study and challenging opportunities. Students enrolled in this option have the opportunity to become more proficient in writing as they are required to complete more written requirements than the resident course officer. Usually they are more proficient in computer skills because most of the work is completed individually at home on personal computers. This option has another advantage in that all students have to meet the same standard because each student has to individually do the work. The greatest advantage for the DEC option is that traditional RC officers who can not attend the resident course can still satisfy military education requirements required for promotion.

The primary disadvantage of taking the DEC course is the lack of interaction with other students. Secondly, there is little opportunity to develop briefing and speaking skills and little sharing of ideas and experiences with others taking the same course.

The USAWC is responsible for producing graduates who understand "how to operate in a strategic security environment and it develops officers who can deal effectively with complex, unstructured problems involving national security."

Additionally, it has prepared officers to "render sound advice and make appropriate decisions when the application of force is being considered as a policy option in conjunction with other measures."¹² Graduates of the USAWC are service qualified through the study of strategic land power. They are qualified to operate in a joint environment through the study of strategic leadership and joint operations. Additionally, graduates are competent with emerging technology, and knowledgeable with the application and science of "strategic art."¹³

Graduates from senior service school normally move to the top of their peer group. These officers possess skills that few non-graduates ever attain. Now we have Lieutenant Colonels and Colonels in the Army, Army Reserve and National Guard, working side by side, but with varying levels of proficiency. Unfortunately, few Reserve Component officers are selected to attend senior service school, therefore, their level of proficiency continues to fall further behind SSC graduates. The result of this program is a "Total Army" of Colonels with significant differences in levels of proficiency. These officers are expected to perform to one standard, even though they are not provided the same tools.

EDUCATION THROUGH EXPERIENCE

Another source of learning that takes place everyday on the job is experiential education. Morgan M. McCall, author of the book High Flyers believes that "the primary classroom for the development of leadership skills is on-the-job experience."¹⁴

*"I had my own business and had to learn to manage every aspect of it. I started from scratch, developing the property, learning how to run everything from cash flow to people. It was a tough business, and I learned to focus on a few factors that could be leveraged to make it successful. I learned how important it is to get to know your customers and your employees inside and out. I learned to be resourceful in everything from custodial chores to strategic planning. It was an invaluable experience."*¹⁵

-From an interview with a corporate executive

Military officers receive their experience from a variety of assignments throughout their careers. The following assignments are necessary to be competitive for consideration for promotion above the rank of Colonel:

- Staff assignments at battalion, brigade, division and corps levels
- Battalion command and Brigade command

- Field time at one of the combat training centers; National Training Center, Fort Irwin, California, Joint National training Center, Fort Polk, Louisiana or the combat training Center, Hoenfeld, Germany
- Command Post Exercises above Brigade (Warfighter Exercises)
- Joint operations experience
- Contingency Operations experience (peacekeeping and humanitarian assistance)

These assignments alone are no guarantee for success at the strategic level. Strategic leaders must be able to perform as a member of the staff at Headquarters Department of the Army, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense or even spend time working at the strategic level in a civilian corporation.

Biographical summaries of one hundred five RC Brigadier Generals were compared to forty-four AC Brigadier Generals with similar qualifications and in similar assignments. While there is not an accurate method to compare RC assignment time against AC assignment time, it is readily apparent that the RC and AC Brigadier General experience vastly differs while in similar assignments. Active duty time is almost continuous while the RC time varies. A Reserve Component commander is expected and does perform more duty days than the normal RC officer. He could drill as few as twelve to fourteen weekends a year too as many as twenty to twenty-eight weekends a year. Reserve component

battalion and brigade commanders normally attend two to four weeks of annual training each year while in command.

The following chart shows a comparison of officers and illustrates their actual experience in four areas: battalion or brigade staff assignments, division or Corp staff assignments battalion command time, brigade command time and joint staff time. As indicated, as the RC officer moves through his career he continues to lose valuable ground in the development of proficiencies needed to be a strategic leader. The months represent the average number of months officers were assigned while the days depicted represent the average number of actual days of performance.

	Battalion/ Brigade Staff Time	Division/Corp Staff Time	Battalion Command Time	Brigade Command Time	Joint Staff Time
Active Duty Officers	28 Months (840 days)	17 Months (510 days)	24 Months (720 days)	24 Months (720 days)	17 Months (510 days)
Reserve Officers	76 Months (242 days)	8 Months (31 days)	28 Months (86 days)	27 Months (84 days)	0 Months (0 days)

Figure 1: Comparison of active duty and reserve component experience.

The experience on battalion and brigade staff shows a 4-1 advantage to the active duty officer which is understandable and acceptable, however, the time spent at division and Corp level is 16-1, and experience in battalion or brigade command is 8-1. The difference of experience in these last two categories is significant. Lack of this experience as well as virtually no joint assignment time puts the RC officer at a disadvantage and near the bottom of his peer group. The following will provide additional information from the survey:

Active Duty Officers:

- 9% of the officers were assigned less than 12 months on battalion or brigade staff
- 32% of the officers were assigned less than 12 months on division or corps staff
- 13% of the officers performed less than 12 months of a joint assignment, however, all were credited with some type of joint experience
- Most active duty battalion and brigade commander's receive at least one opportunity to perform at one of the combat training centers (Joint Readiness Training Center (JRTC), National Training Center (NTC), or Combat Maneuver Training Center (CMTC))
- 100% of the officers surveyed, completed the resident Command and Staff Officer Course at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas and a resident senior service college which might include the United States Army War College at Carlisle, Pennsylvania.

- 27 of the active duty officer files were currently assigned as assistant division commanders or had previous experience as an assistant division commander
- 100% of the AC officer files reviewed competed battalion and brigade command

Reserve Component Officers:

- 9% of the RC officers were assigned for less than 12 months on battalion or brigade staff
- 84% of the RC officers received no experience at division or corps level as a staff officer
- No joint assignments were noted on biographical summaries (Some of these officers may have worked with other services at State Headquarters. However, this experience would do little to prepare for fighting in a joint environment)
- Selected units (company or battalion) perform OPFOR missions at combat readiness centers. Most missions are platoon and company size. The enhanced brigades will rotate through a combat readiness center as the blue force once every eight years. This will allow one of every three enhanced brigade commanders to perform as a battalion or brigade commander at one of these centers.
- 19 of the RC officers were currently assigned as assistant division commanders, of these only 16% attended the resident United States Army War College and 40% attended the Distance Learning United States Army War College. 44% of the 19 were not graduates of any senior service school.

- 22% of the RC officers reached brigadier general who did not command at battalion level
- 30% of the RC officers reached brigade general who did not command at brigade level.

Currently the Army is preparing for the future by addressing issues critical to Force XXI. Advanced Warfighting studies are being conducted, along with an inordinate effort towards developing the Army After Next. Current trends indicate the total Army may get smaller with more dependence on the reserves. Reserve Component leaders must be prepared to meet these changes especially in a world of uncertainty, a world in which technology will dictate future operational capabilities.¹⁶

To complete the review of requirements facing reserve component officers a look at the environment in which the action will occur must be examined. Leaders of the future must be able to act intelligently, yet independently. Today's rapidly changing technology, along with the volume of information available, will only add complexity to an already compressed decision-analysis cycle.¹⁷ The rise in lethality and quick delivery of weapons systems will be cause to respond quicker than ever before. Senior leaders must be trained and ready to respond when called to duty. They must be the trainers, not the trainee, during the 60-120 days required to bring reserve units up to satisfactory readiness levels. Our emerging joint doctrine

criticality of integrating all service capabilities within a unified war-fighting effort.¹⁸ With virtually no joint experience the RC officer is simply unprepared to answer the call. As U.S. forces shrink, dependability on outside resourcing will continue to grow. RC and AC officers must be prepared to work side by side with government and non-government agencies and educate them at the same time.¹⁹

LESSONS FROM CIVILIAN LEADERSHIP

The Army is not the only place that is interested in training leaders for the future. Valuable lessons can be learned from industry. The private sector has invested heavily in the search for good solutions to develop future leaders. The Economist Intelligence Unit, working in close co-operation with Korn/Ferry International, conducted research over a one-year period ending in May 1996. The purpose of the research was to evaluate how corporations develop leadership and what changes must be implemented to successfully perform in the 21st century. The study identified a "top ten" list of specific observations.

1. *Tomorrow's leader is in the works today.* Companies believe that leadership can be developed, and among the elite companies, there exists a well-defined menu of essential tools for this purpose. Executives compiled and rank ordered the

following list: rotation, fast tracking, succession planning, and leadership recruitment.

2. *Not all individuals are strong candidates to become leaders.* Leadership development usually begins in childhood, but it further develops on the job.

3. *Marketing is today the fastest way to the top.*

Consistently across all continents, marketing was shown to be the experience of choice.

4. *There is a new language of leadership.* Today companies like to describe themselves using such words as "empowered", "process-oriented", "networks", "alliances", "shared values", "shared culture", "consensus", and "involvement".

5. *Leadership styles are in transition.* When asked to describe what leadership style future organizations would adopt, we found that command and control is condemned virtually to disappear and will be replaced by a combination of styles, principally one based on sharing information and power, and spreading decision making and responsibility throughout the entire organization.

6. *The shift is towards empowerment.* Tomorrow's leader will disperse power and information, as well as responsibility. The corporate leader will use all possible forms of

communication to create and sustain a goal-oriented organization.

7. *Providing vision is perhaps the most critical leadership task.* The primary leadership responsibility of all executives inside their organizations is to use vision to inspire their members continually to move towards the larger goals of the institution.

8. *The most effective measurement of leadership in the next century will be customer satisfaction rather than profitability.* Today, companies rate immediate bottom-line profitability more highly than customer satisfaction as a gauge for effectiveness of leadership. In the future, customer satisfaction will move convincingly into the lead position.

9. *Diversity will expand.* Observers believe tomorrow's leadership ranks will be more culturally and gender diverse.

10. *There is no single model for building leadership.* Both interviews and statistics support the notion that needed infrastructure will be different in every case. Twelve percent of those surveyed insist there is no model, that all-leadership is an innate ability that cannot be developed in-house. Although when interviewed, most managers agreed that leadership could be enhanced through appropriate experience.²⁰

This survey, realistically, does not conclude that leadership can be manufactured.²¹ It does suggest that developing

leaders is a complex process that requires a great deal of time and effort. There is no easy solution. In today's open market, a company's competitiveness is the sum of every function within that company. The Economist Intelligence Unit found that "enhancing the inter-relation and performance of corporate functions cannot possibly be done under central control. Management must be more than creative; they must foster creativity throughout all employees. Managers can and must take steps to identify and cultivate leaders they already have. Failure to do so means just that, failure."²²

SUMMARY

"The U.S. Army today is truly one team, built on the strength and character of its people - Active, Army National Guard, and U.S. Army Reserve soldiers ... the Total Army has changed both physically and culturally to meet the challenges of today and the new century."²³ These words describe America's Army Today. In order to truly become a seamless force, full integration of the Army, Army Reserve and National Guard must occur. The best way to attain total integration is with an officer professional education system that is equally available to both AC and RC officers.

The current officer professional development program is not broken by any means; however, minor adjustments to the current

system are necessary and must start with the formal education system at the Command and General Staff Officer college. It is not practical to abandon the Reserve Component four phase correspondence option for those RC officers that simply can not leave their civilian employment. The current resident CGSOC option can and should be modified to accommodate the RC officer who is in the top half of his peer group and can afford the time to attend in a resident status. The USAWC also requires minor adjustments.

RECOMMENDATION

CGSC could be offered in two options: a corresponding studies option and a combination of corresponding studies and resident option. The first option, corresponding studies (Distance Education) would be offered in four phases I, II, III and IV. This option may not require any changes to the current corresponding studies (Distance Education) program.

The second option would require minor changes to the current resident program. All officers would attend Phase I in the corresponding studies (Distance Education) option and Phase II, III and IV in a resident status. All officers selected to attend the resident course would attend a five-month resident option at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas upon completion of Phase I. This option would be available two times during each calendar

year, allowing a larger number of officers to attend. A sixteen person seminar would be composed of one Navy or Marine student, one Air Force student, one foreign student, seven Army active duty students and six Army RC (Army Reserve and National Guard) students.

The United States Army War College resident program would require minor changes. One of the few ways a RC officer can learn Joint Operations is at the USAWC. Therefore, RC officer attendance must be increased. The following three options are offered for consideration:

Option one: Keep the Distance Education program and resident program the same except for increasing the number of Reserve Component (Army Reserve and National Guard) resident students by sixty-four and reducing the number of Army active duty resident students by sixty-four. These active duty soldiers would attend in a DEC status.

Option Two: Increase the number of RC officers in the resident course by sixty-four. This option would require four additional sixteen-person seminars. If option one is unacceptable and there are not adequate facilities at Carlisle Barracks to accommodate the increase in student population then a third option should be considered.

Option Three: This option would maintain the Distance Education course as it currently is but make significant changes

to the current resident course. The revised resident course would become a combination one-half Distance Education course work and one-half resident coursework. The resident option would be reduced to a five-month period, conducted twice a year. This option presents many advantages; first there would be a significant increase in resident course graduates, second the Reserve Component would receive equal treatment, third the cost would be reduced significantly and the current staffing requirement could actually be reduced.

With the adoption of "One Team, One Fight, One Future" philosophy, the Army has already taken some steps to increase the experience level of the RC officer. The two integrated divisions will provide valuable experience for RC brigade level commanders, as they will work for a full-time active duty division headquarters. Force XXI initiatives are looking at multi-component units and "teaming concepts" that will allow RC officers training opportunities which are not currently available. Divisional-Teaming is another concept that will provide opportunities to conduct joint planning, training and readiness assessments.

These initiatives will help close the experiential gap, but not enough to provide a RC officer all the tools necessary for future leadership. Figure 2 provides an example of what a typical biographical profile would look like in the year 2010.

Rank	Assignment	Schools
Captain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Company command (3 years), battalion or brigade staff (3years), 10% of company grade officers afforded ADSW for 2-3 weeks at a combat training center or at a major exercise with an active division 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * 25% of company grade officers attend the resident advanced course * 25% of company grade officers attend resident CAS3
Major	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * 10% of reserve component officers afforded ADSW at a combat training center for 3 weeks * 10% of reserve component officers afforded ADSW with a division for 2-3 weeks * 5% of reserve component officers afforded the opportunity to exchange with active duty S-3 or XO for period of 180 days or a joint assignment for 180 days 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * 50% reserve component officers selected to attend the resident CGSC
LTC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Battalion command (2years), brigade XO or division staff, or Corp staff (3years) * 10% of reserve component officers afforded ADSW at a combat training center for 3 weeks * 5% of reserve component officers afforded the opportunity to exchange with active G-3 for period of 180 days or a joint assignment for 180 days 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * 10% reserve component officers selected to attend senior service school with at least 5% resident
Colonel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Brigade Command (2 years), Division XO or Corp level staff assignment (2 years), Joint assignment (1 year minimum) * 5% reserve component officers serve in a joint assignment for 180 days 	

Figure 2: Sample biographic profile of a strategic leader in the reserve component in the year 2010.

Here are the essential requirements for the RC to gain the necessary knowledge and experience to lead at the strategic level:

- He needs the opportunity to experience the same formal education as the active duty soldier. This means attendance at the resident CGSOC and attendance at one of the resident senior service schools.
- Active Duty for training opportunities as an operations officer at Brigade level or an active division during a Field Training Exercise i.e. a two-week period at one of the combat training centers. This must be in addition to his normal annual training period. The Reserve Component must be allocated additional funding for this requirement.
- Each Reserve Component division must have an active division counterpart ("teaming concept") to provide assistance for lane training and evaluations at the annual training sites as well as assistance during weekend training assembly's. Currently divisional units receive little to no support from the TSB's.
- Enhanced Brigades must be allowed to rotate through the combat training centers once every four years or another site developed to allow these brigades the needed time to gain experience. Divisional brigades should be integrated into their active division partner's during these rotations.
- Joint assignments and experience is the single greatest deficiency in the RC officer. Lieutenant Colonels identified to be Brigade commanders or with senior level officer potential must be afforded the

opportunity to work from six to twelve months in a joint assignment.

Senior reserve component leadership must also take the responsibility to ensure leaders are provided challenging opportunities that will prepare them for leadership at the strategic level. This will include but not be limited to short assignments out of their specialty i.e. an infantry officer with emphasis in operations at the battalion and brigade level must experience assignments in logistics, maintenance, transportation at division or at a state headquarters. It is imperative that leaders identified and selected for future strategic leadership positions be well rounded.

CONCLUSION

The bridge to the future is best defined in the Chief of Staffs "One Team, One Fight, One Future" document. It states "the Army's current and planned programs will serve as our bridge to the future, a future that moves Total Army Integration from coordinating three components to building one seamless 21st Century Force, a common culture based on common training, doctrine, experience, and shared knowledge." It further states "this force might include: a single education, training, readiness, and deployment system for the Total Army."²⁴ If we are to be one seamless force prepared to meet the challenges before

us, with this philosophy we might make it. However, if we choose to ensure success in the future, then we will have one seamless single education system available to both AC and RC officers.

Today's Army is a model for corporate America. We have the best professional education system in the world; our leader development program is second to none, that is for those officers fortunate enough to participate in the process. Unfortunately, this great system of ours is flawed, we have created a shortcut, an easy way for the Reserve Component officer to meet minimum requirements. Though not by his choice, limited resources have restricted RC officers to take the only road offered and this path stops far short of the objective.

This broad definition of "qualified" has allowed this great Army to produce two sets of strategic military leaders, both fully qualified but with a significant difference in the level of proficiency.

Since the end of the Cold War, the world has changed, the Army has changed, soldiers have changed and now our professional officer development program must change.²⁵ America can no longer afford to produce RC officers that meet only the minimum requirements. As the Army leader development program improves we must ensure both AC and RC officers are provided the proper tools needed to meet all challenges of the 21st Century.

Word Count: 5981

ENDNOTES

¹ GEN Dennis J. Reimer, MG Thomas J. Plewes, and MG Roger C. Schultz. "Taking the Total Army Idea into the Next Century." ROA National Security Report, The Officer, October 1998, 30.

² Command and General Staff College, "Mission of Non Resident Studies," 30 November 1998; available from <<http://www-cgsc.army.mil/nrs/mission.htm>>; Internet; accessed 20 January 1999, 1.

³ Ibid, 2.

⁴ LTC Merv Gleason, Chief, TASS Office, DAO, CGSC, telephone interview by author, 19 October 1998.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Command and General Staff College, "Mission of Non Resident Studies," 35.

⁷ Jim Tice, "Overhauling Officer Education: Arms Center, Staff College Tackle OPMS XXI Challenge," Army Times, 21 December 1998, 21.

⁸ Army War College, Curriculum Pamphlet Academic Year 1999, Carlisle Barracks: U.S. Army War College, 1998, v.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Command and General Staff College, "Mission of Non Resident Studies," 35.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid, 4.

¹³ Ibid, 5.

¹⁴ Morgan W. McCall, High Flyers: Developing the next Generation of Leaders (Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 1998), vii.

¹⁵ Ibid, 61.

¹⁶ GEN Dennis J. Reimer, "One Team, One Fight, One Future," Concept statement for achieving Total Army integration. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Defense, n.d.), 10.

¹⁷ Douglas A. Macgregor, Breaking the Phalanx: A New Design for Landpower in the 21st Century (Westport: Praeger Publishers, 1997), 50.

¹⁸ "Concepts & Issues '98, 'Building a Corp for the 21st Century,'" In course 4, Volume IIa (Carlisle Barracks, 19 November 1998 - 25 January 1999), 11-7.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Economist Intelligence Unit, Developing Leadership for the 21st Century (New York, NY: Korn/Ferry International, 1996), 5-24.

²¹ Ibid, 27.

²² Ibid, 25-27.

²³ Robert M. Walker, and GEN Dennis J. Reimer, United States Army Posture Statement FY99: A Statement on the Posture of the United States Army Fiscal Year 1999, Posture Statement presented to the 105th Cong., 2d sess., (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Defense, February 1998), 3.

²⁴ Reimer, "One Team, One Fight, One Future", 21.

²⁵ K.L. Frey, and Kristina Handy, Ethical Leadership: A Leadership for All Seasons, (Manassas, Virginia, n.d.), 13.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arroyo Center. The "Virtual Corporation" and Army Organization, Research Year 1997-1998: Annual Report. Washington, D.C.: Arroyo Center, March 1998.

Brace, Robert A., II. AY99 Curriculum Guidance. Carlisle Barracks: U.S. Army War College, 9 March 1998.

Burnette, Thomas N., Jr. "Building Better Leaders." Army 48 (October 1998): 121-24.

Clinton, William J. A National Security Strategy for a New Century. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Defense, May 1997.

..... A National Security Strategy for a New Century. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Defense, October 1998.

Cohen, William S. Report of the Quadrennial Defense Review. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Defense, May 1997.

"Concepts & Issues '98, 'Building a Corps for the 21st Century.'" In Course 4, Implementing National Military Strategy, Volume IIa. Carlisle Barracks: U.S. Army War College, 19 November 1998-25 January 1999.

Cragin, Charles L. "Total Force Integration: The Way Ahead." ROA National Security Report. The Officer, September 1998, 27-29.

Economist Intelligence Unit. Developing Leadership for the 21st Century. New York, NY: Korn/Ferry International, 1996.

Frey, K.L., and Kristina Handy. Ethical Leadership: A Leadership For All Seasons. Manassas, Virginia, n.d.

Gayhart, Alan C. The National Guard Revolution in Military Affairs. Strategic Research Project. Carlisle Barracks: U.S. Army War College, 1997.

Gleason, Merv, LTC, Chief, TASS Office, DAO, CGSC. Telephone interview by author, 19 October 1998.

Macgregor, Douglas A. Breaking the Phalanx: A New Design for Landpower in the 21st Century. Westport: Praeger, 1997.

McCall, Morgan W. High Flyers: Developing the next Generation of Leaders. Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 1998.

Reimer, Dennis J., GEN. "Leadership for the 21st Century: Empowerment, Environment and the Golden Rule." Military Review 16 (January-February 1996): 4-9.

_____. "Random Thoughts While Running." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Army, n.d.

_____. "One Team, One Fight, One Future". Concept statement for achieving Total Army integration. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Defense, n.d.

_____. MG Thomas J. Plewes, and MG Roger C. Schultz. "Taking the Total Army Idea into the Next Century." ROA National Security Report. The Officer, October 1998, 29-31.

Tice, Jim. "Overhauling Officer Education: Arms Center, Staff College Tackle OPMS XXI Challenge." Army Times 59 (December 21, 1998): 21.

Ulmer, Walter F. "Military Leadership Into the 21st Century: Another Bridge Too Far?" n.p.: 1 November 1997.

U.S. Army War College. Curriculum Pamphlet Academic Year 1999. Carlisle Barracks: U.S. Army War College, 1998.

_____. Department of Distance Education: Catalogue for Academic Year 2000. Carlisle Barracks: U.S Army War College, 1998.

U.S. Command and General Staff College. "Mission of Non Resident Studies." 30 November 1998. Available from <<http://www-cgsc.army.mil/nrs/mission.htm>>. Internet. Accessed 20 January 1999.

_____. Directorate of Non-Resident Studies (DNRS). Telephone interview by author, November 1998.

U.S. Department of Army Training and Doctrine Command. Force XXI Operations. TRADOC Pamphlet 525-5. Ft. Monroe: U.S. Department of the Army, 1 August 1994.

U.S. Joint Warfighting Center. Concept for Future Joint Operations: Expanding Joint Vision 2010. Fort Monroe, VA: U.S. Joint Warfighting Center, May 1997.

Walker, Robert M., and Dennis J. Reimer, GEN. United States Army Posture Statement FY99: A Statement on the Posture of the United States Army Fiscal Year 1999. Posture Statement presented to the 105th Cong., 2d sess. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, February 1998.